

REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0121790 (Wolff et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,711,011 (Urs et al.).

By the present response, Applicant has amended the claims 1-3 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-3 remain pending in the present application.

Response to Arguments

In the “Response to Arguments” section of the Office Action on Page 9, the Examiner again fails to respond to any of Applicant’s specific arguments. The Examiner again merely makes the exact same general statement made in the previous Office Action stating that “the Examiner respectfully disagrees as the applied reference(s) provide more than adequate support and to further clarify (see the above claims for relevant citations).” This does nothing to help advance prosecution of the present application. The Examiner has not responded to any of Applicant’s specific arguments distinguishing the claims of the present application from the asserted reference. Moreover, although the Examiner makes reference to “relevant citations and comments”, the Examiner has merely asserted essentially the exact same portions of the same reference as asserted in the previous Office Action. Applicant again respectfully requests that the Examiner help advance prosecution of the present application by providing detailed responses to each and every one of Applicant’s arguments.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolff et al. in view of Urs et al.

Since the Examiner has again failed to provide any adequate response to any of Applicant’s previously-filed arguments as to why they are not valid, they have been resubmitted here for the Examiner’s consideration. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and provides the following previous and additional remarks.

Regarding claims 1-3, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims. For example, Applicant submits that none of the cited references disclose or suggest recording the conference call within the network infrastructure of the mobile telephone network used to broadcast the conference call in response to a signal from the group member, as recited in the claims of the present application. The Examiner again asserts that these limitations are disclosed in Wolff et al. at paragraphs 18, 19, 46-48 and 51. However, Wolff et al. merely discloses that the AIRS continuously monitors and records audio information communicated between communication devices used by members of a group, and that AIRS 102 is able to identify communications as originating from communication devices used by members of a particular group based upon information identifying the devices included in the communicated audio information and based upon group identification information accessible to AIRS 102, and that the group identification information accessible to AIRS 102 identifies one or more groups whose communications may be monitored and recorded by AIRS 102., where AIRS 102 can determine the identity of the communication device that transmitted the audio information, and determine a group to which the originating communication device belongs based upon the group identification information. This is not recording the conference call within the network infrastructure of the mobile telephone network used to broadcast the conference call in response to a signal from the group member, as recited in the claims of the present application. In addition, the disclosure in Wolff et al. that the monitoring and recording of the audio information can occur for a period of time or identify communications as originating from communication devices used by members of a particular group based upon information identifying the devices included in the communicated audio information and based upon group identification information, is not the recording the conference call being in response to a signal from the group member. Urs also fails to disclose or suggest these limitations. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner to specifically point out where these limitations are disclosed or suggested in any of the cited references.

Further, none of the cited references disclose or suggest transferring the recorded conference call to a voicemail server and copying the recorded conference call to a mailbox of the mobile telephone device users that did not participate in the conference call. The Examiner asserts that Wolff et al. discloses these limitations in paragraphs 28-30 and 72. However, as noted previously, Wolff merely discloses using an audio information recorder system (AIRS) to monitor and record communications between communication devices (see, paragraph 27). This is not transferring the recorded conference call to a voice mail server, as recited in the claims of the present application. AIRS is merely an audio information recorder system (see, par. 190) and may even be incorporated as part of one of the communication devices (see, par. 20). The AIRS disclosed in Wolff et al. is not a voicemail server, as recited in the claims of the present application. Urs also fails to disclose or suggest these limitations. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner to specifically point out where these limitations are disclosed or suggested in any of the cited references.

Moreover, none of the cited references disclose or suggest copying the recorded conference call to a mailbox of the mobile telephone device users that did not participate in the conference call. The Examiner asserts that Wolff et al. discloses these limitations in paragraphs 34 and 72. However, Wolff et al. merely discloses that AIRS archives audio information corresponding to conversations (see, par. 27) and that users may retrieve the archived audio information, where users may be members of one or more groups, other users who may not be members of any group, and others (see, par. 28). Wolff et al. discloses merely storing the audio information for general access by anyone. Wolff does not disclose or suggest a mailbox of mobile telephone device users, or copying the recorded conference call to a mailbox of the mobile telephone device users. Urs also fails to disclose or suggest these limitations. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner to specifically point out where these limitations are disclosed or suggested in any of the cited references.

In addition, none of the cited references disclose or suggest the conference call being stored as a series of short monologues, one monologue for each change of speaker, as recited in the claims of the present application. These limitations are neither disclosed or suggested by any of the cited references.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-3 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-3 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions about the present amendment or anticipates finally rejecting any claim of the present application, a telephone interview is requested.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4365.

Respectfully submitted,

Troy Bourgeois
(Applicant)



Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282
Moore & Van Allen PLLC
P.O. Box 13706
Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27709
Telephone: (919) 286-8000
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199

Date: December 16, 2008